



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
| 10/559,681 | 12/06/2005 | Lev Davidovich Rasnetsov | U 016055-9 | 3010 | |
| 140 | 7590 | 09/24/2008 | EXAMINER | | |
| LADAS & PARRY LLP 26 WEST 61ST STREET NEW YORK, NY 10023 | | | JEAN-LOUIS, SAMIRA JM | | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | | |
| 1617 | | PAPER | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 09/24/2008 | | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/559,681 | Applicant(s) RASNETSOV ET AL. |
| | Examiner SAMIRA JEAN-LOUIS | Art Unit 1617 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-6 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

I. Group I, claim 1, is drawn to an agent for inhibiting membrane virus reproduction, characterized in that it comprises a water soluble compound of fullrene polycarboxylic anions of the general formula $C_{60} H_n[NH(CH_2)_mC(O)O]_n$ where C_{60} is the fullrene core, $NH(CH_2)_mC(O)O^-$ is the aminocarboxylic anion, m is an integer, preferably 3 and 5, most preferably 5, n is an integer from 2 to 12, preferably from 4 to 6, most preferably 6.

II. Group II, claim 2, is drawn to a method for the production of an agent for inhibiting membrane virus reproduction, characterized in that an amino acid in the form of potassium or sodium salt is introduced into an o-dichlorobenzene solution to fullrene, then a solubilizer selected from the group of polyethylene oxides is added: polyethylene glyclos with a molecular weight of 150 to 400 and higher, and also dimethyl ethers of polyethylene glycols or 18-crown-6, wherein the amount of the amino acid should be more than 50 times that of fullrene and the synthesis is carried out at a temperature of 60-80°C.

III. Group III, claims 3-4, are drawn to a pharmaceutical composition for inhibiting membrane virus reproduction, characterized in that it contains the agent according to claim 1 in an effective amount and pharmaceutically acceptable fillers.

IV. Group IV, claims 5-6, are drawn to a method for inhibiting membrane virus reproduction, characterized in that the pharmaceutical composition according to claim 1 is used for the suppression of viruses when treating diseases caused by HIV, herpes viruses, hepatitis C virus.

The inventions listed as Groups I, II, III, and IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features.

An international application should relate to only one invention or, if there is more than one invention, the inclusion of those inventions in one international application is only permitted if all inventions are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (PCT Rule 13.1). With respect to a group of inventions claimed in an international application, unity of invention exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

The expression "special technical features" is defined in PCT Rule 13.2 as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The determination is made on the contents of the claims as interpreted in light of the description and drawings.

Whether or not any specific technical feature makes a "contribution" over the prior art, and therefore constitutes a "special technical feature", should be considered with respect to novelty and inventive step.

In this instant application, the common technical feature in all groups is the water soluble compound of fullrene polycarboxylic anions of the general formula $C_{60}H_n[NH(CH_2)_mC(O)O]_n$. This agent or compound cannot be said to be a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2 because this agent is shown in the prior art.

In this case, Miller et al. (RU Patent 2196602) teaches dipeptide derivatives of fullerene of the general formula $C_{60}\text{-}X$ where C_{60} means fullerene nucleus; X means $NH\text{-}CHR\text{-}COOH$, $NH\text{-}(CH_2)_n\text{-}COOH$, $NH\text{-}CHR\text{-}CO\text{-}NH\text{-}CHR\text{-}COOH$ where $n = 2\text{-}6$ (see abstract). As a result, no special technical features exist among the different groups because the inventions in Groups I, II, III, and IV fail to make a contribution over the prior art with respect to novelty and inventive step. In conclusion, there is a lack of unity of inventions, and therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Species Election

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species either possess contrasting chemical and/or physical properties (i.e. m is 3 vs. $m=5$ would possess contrasting physical properties). Thus, these species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species listed below do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same special technical feature among the different species. The following claims 1-6 are generic.

The species are as follows:

Applicant is required to elect the compound to be included in the aforementioned inventions. Applicant is further cautioned to provide both name and corresponding name of the elected compound.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is also reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

No telephone call was made due to the complexity of the election/restriction.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samira Jean-Louis whose telephone number is 571-270-3503. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 PM EST M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. J. L. /

Examiner, Art Unit 1617

09/19/08

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617